

the United States, and ought to be resisted at every hazard, and to any extremity.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to appoint a number of delegates to meet at Nashville in Southern convention, in June next.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 21, 1850.

DEBATES IN CONGRESS.—We have no room this week for notices of the speeches of Messrs. Fitch, Root, and Mann, in reply to the numerous speeches in support of the claims of Slavery. We shall attend to them in our next.

THE CHAIR.—We may not ask our friends to read their exertion for the extension of the circulation of the *Era* in this important crisis. Never before was it so vital to have the Public correctly and fully informed of the movements in Congress. Of the four political papers in this place, the *Era* is the only one which presents and advocates the views and claims of the non-slaveholders of the country on this great question of Slavery.

No. 155 of the *Era*.—These subscribers who do not file their *Era*, and have copies of No. 155 on hand, will confer a favor by remitting them to this office.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

WILLIAM W. WOODWORTH, administrator of William Woodworth, deceased, is now petitioning Congress to extend his Patent for a Fishing Machine for another long term. All those opposed to this monopoly, and the injustice of the REPEATED EXTENSIONS of that Patent, are requested to forward their remonstrances against the same to their respective Senators and Representatives in Congress, without any delay.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE 11TH.

THE RIGHT OF PETITION.—THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

We present on our fourth page some account of the Debate in the Senate on the 11th of February, on the question of receiving a petition offered by Mr. Hale on a former day, in relation to a dissolution of the Union. The petition set forth that the Federal Constitution, in supporting Slavery, violated the Divine law; that the experiment of uniting Slavery and Freedom under one Government had failed; and closed by respectfully asking Congress to propose, without delay, some plan for the immediate and peaceful dissolution of the American Union.

The petition was respectful in its language and tone. The signers to it did not ask Congress to dissolve the Union, but to propose some plan for its dissolution, evidently under the impression that such a movement was within its constitutional powers. Is this impression correct?

Article 5th of the Constitution provides as follows: "Congress, whenever two-thirds of either House shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; and in no case shall any amendment be made which shall affect the equal suffrage of the States."

"Congress, whenever two-thirds of either House shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; and in no case shall any amendment be made which shall affect the equal suffrage of the States."

The signers to this petition have doubtless noticed that in the proceedings of Legislative bodies it is common for a member to move to amend a bill or resolution, by striking out all after the enacting clause, or the word resolved, and inserting a substitute; and, observing that, by the Constitution, Congress, by a majority of two-thirds in each House, is empowered to propose amendments thereto, they may have inferred that it could propose to amend by substituting a substitute, contemplating, for example, the formation of two separate Unions.

No Senator adverted to this possibility, nor seemed to think of inquiring how far Congress could go in proposing amendments. All who opposed the reception of the petition assumed that it proposed Congress to abolish the Union—a thing so manifestly and wholly beyond its power, that it was right to reject the paper at once. This was the assumption made by Messrs. Davis and Webster of Massachusetts—an assumption utterly groundless, as the petition asked simply that Congress would propose a plan of dissolution. Is this manifestly and wholly beyond its power? It is a question with two sides.—It admits of argument. The language of the article respecting amendments, quoted above, raises a presumption, at least, that Congress, by the requisite majorities, is competent to submit such a proposition. What, then, was the dictate of common sense, in relation to the petition? To receive it; and, if no disposition prevailed to act upon it in any way, to lay it upon the table; but, if otherwise, to refer it to an appropriate committee, with suitable instructions. Should the Senate decide that it had not the power to execute the request of the petition, that decision would be a good reason for denying the prayer, but no reason at all for refusing to receive the petition.

Could we be surprised at any notions put forth in Congress, we could be surprised at the notions of several learned Senators concerning the Right of Petition. Judge Underwood defined two limitations, as he called them, upon this right.—1st, Want of power in the body petitioned; 2d, Exemption of the persons petitioning from the operation of the exercise of power petitioned for. Where Congress had no right to grant the prayer of a petition, it could not receive it; nor ought it to receive a petition praying for action or non-action, where neither could affect the petitioners! On one or the other of these grounds he would refuse to receive nearly all the petitions touching the Slavery Question. For example, he would reject one, praying the abolition of the interstate slave trade, in consequence of a want of power to act on that subject; another, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, because such abolition could in no way affect the petitioners residing out of the District.

These would be reasons to urge against granting the prayer of a petition, but no reasons at all for refusing to receive it. To refuse to receive, is a violation or abridgment of the right of petition, and is not demanded by the rights or dignity of Congress. To refuse to grant, after hearing, is no invasion of the right of petition, is a sufficient safeguard of the rights and dignity of Congress, and of the provisions of the Constitution. The examples referred to show the unreasonableness of any such limitation, limitations unknown to the Constitution, and never recognized by any Government. In regard to the interstate slave trade, Public Opinion is not settled. It is a subject admitting of apparently strong arguments for and against. Mr. Underwood doubtless denies the power, but it would cost him an elaborate argument to demonstrate that it does not exist.

Then as to Slavery in the District of Columbia. Its abolition, the slaveholders of the State say, would be a blow at the stability of their peculiar institution: although not citizens here, their rights, they insist, would be indirectly damaged. On the other hand, the People of the North say, as to Slavery existing in this District by act of Congress, in Congress by which they are represented, they are involved in the legislative support of what they believe to be wrong. Besides, they say, the existence of Slavery gives an undue advantage to the supporters of Slavery, against the Representatives from the free States, and fosters their freedom. For these and other reasons, they insist, upon the abolition of Slavery in the District, as a measure of influence on their rights and interests.

Now, here we are, conflicting demands, conflicting interests—but Mr. Underwood, without paying the least attention to them, says that petitioners concerning Slavery in the District of Columbia

beyond its limits ought not to be received, because the existence or abolition of Slavery affects nobody but those living here!

Members of Congress are not released from their obligation of giving reasons for their acts. Nothing is more common than differences of opinion in relation to the powers conferred by the Federal Constitution. These differences are legitimate subjects of discussion. Because I hold a certain subject of discussion, I have no right to one view of the Constitution, I have no right to refuse a hearing to an opposite view, respectfully presented. Senators and Representatives are not above the People. When respectable citizens submit to them a petition, the presumption is that they believe their request reasonable, and believe that Congress has power to grant what they pray for. Senators and Representatives may hold a different opinion—but this is no reason for refusing to entertain the petition. If they may refuse to receive it because they believe they have no power to grant its prayer, they may do the same thing, for example, they may regard the prayer unreasonable or inexpedient. Refusal to receive in the latter case would be no greater abridgment of the right of petition, than it would be in the former.

The right of petition on one side presupposes the duty of receiving on the other. A Senator believes that the petition asked for, impugned the petitioners' belief is proper. Very well, let the former first hear, then consider, and then state to the petitioner why he declines to grant his prayer. Senators believe they have no power to do a certain act; certain petitioners, believing that they have, ask them to do it. What is the plain duty of the former? To hear, to consider, and then to state to the petitioner their decision, with the reasons therefor.

We know that such is the opinion of the great majority of the American People. Such was the view of John Quincy Adams, which, through many years of toil and persecution, he continually urged upon the House of Representatives, until at last he procured the abrogation of the twenty-first rule, and reestablished, so to speak, a branch of the National Legislature was concerned, the right of petition.

Against this view, the Senate of the United States, three members alone excepted, has planted itself. It has assumed authority to abridge the right of petition. Messrs. DAVIS and WEBSTER, Senators from a State, whose most intrepid son was the warm sympathizer of the world by his heroic struggle for the restoration of this sacred right, now pour contempt upon his memory, by virtually charging him with folly. For, if a legislative body may refuse to consider, to hear, to receive petitions from the People, because it chooses to assume without consideration that it has no power to grant their prayer, we should like to know what John Quincy Adams contended for.

We hope the People will observe the position of these gentlemen, and of the other Senators from the free States. They do not want a dissolution of the Union, but they know that the best way to strengthen the popular feeling against it, is to observe scrupulously, secretly, all the guarantees of rights in the Constitution. They may doubt whether Congress has the right to propose any plan of Dissolution, and would regard with abhorrence any attempt on its part to do so, but in all this they will find reason, not for refusing to receive petitions on the subject, but for sternly rejecting their prayer. They will recognize no authority in an American Senate to break down one part of the Constitution on the pretext of preserving integrity of the whole.

THE SOUTHERN CONVENTION.

The project of a Southern Convention fails to command the unanimous support of the South. The *Richmond (Va.) Whig* is evidently hostile to it, but acquiesces in the modified report of the committee on the subject in the Virginia Legislature, which merely recommends the appointment of delegates by the People, and does not propose to close them by any authority.

The same paper says that the press of all parties in Western Virginia are out against the movement.

The *Richmond (N. C.) Register* says: "What, then, is the Convention to be called for? Why do not the individuals who are pressing the movement tell us what is the object? Unhappily, they do not, and the Convention will be a long time before committing itself, by the hands of a few men, to abide whatever course they may think proper to adopt."

"If dissolution is not aimed at, we do not clearly see the necessity for the Convention. It could effect no more perfect unanimity of sentiment than exists at present, and could not express Southern sentiment more strongly than it has already been done by the Legislatures of most of the Southern States."

"If dissolution is the object of the Convention, we submit that the State of North Carolina will hardly be committed to the project by a set of irresponsible delegates. They must be clothed with full authority, and must be authorized to sanction that can be conferred by the usual happy process of court-house and cross-roads meetings."

The *National Intelligencer*, which is laboring manfully for the preservation of the Union, contains, in its edition of the 16th, extracts from twenty-three prominent Southern newspapers, in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, expressing the most decided opposition to the project of a Southern Convention, and hostility to all projects of Disunion. From our own exchanges in the South we could add many more.

For one, we shall not condemn in advance the Southern Convention. It will be time enough to denounce it as treasonous, when it shall have committed some overt act. That the People of any section of the country have a perfect right to assemble in convention to consult upon their supposed grievances, and to propose remedies for them, no man in his senses will deny. And we have no objection that such Convention should calculate the value of the Union. Americans are a calculating People. We know nothing so sacred that it should command our blind veneration. The Union we would cherish, not as an end, but as a means—a means for the establishment of Justice, Peace, Tranquillity, for the extension and preservation of Free Institutions. Failing in these respects, it would be worthless. We do not believe it has thus failed—it has answered these high ends, imperfectly it may be, but yet better than any other political organization that could have been formed in this country; and we hope that it will be rendered still more efficacious for the accomplishment of these noble purposes. This is our calculation. Were it not so, did we believe with certain citizens of the North that it was a mere instrument for the aggrandizement of one section at the expense of another, and the overthrow of State rights, we should be a Disunionist in principle, and stand prepared to avow and defend our convictions.

Let the value of the Union be calculated—we have no fear of the result. Let the Southern Convention be held—let the wisest and best citizens of the South meet to take into consideration the question whether the substantial interests of the South and of the whole country can be promoted by a dissolution of the compact that binds the States in one Republic. Let them calculate the value of the Union, and the consequences of Disunion. A committee of the ablest men of the South might be constituted to inquire into the relations of the Union, to

The Growth of Civilization on this Continent. The Power and Wealth of the Republic. Its exemption from Foreign Intrigue and Interference.

The Cause of Peace. The Cause of Free Trade. The Establishment of Justice and Domestic Tranquillity.

Also into the probable consequences of Disunion in relation to

Peace, Trade, Social connection between the divided States. Their Ability to resist Foreign Aggression. The Amount and Cost and Results of the Military Establishments that would then become necessary.

The augmentation of Executive Power at the expense of Popular Sovereignty that would be required by the new Government.

The Disposition of the Territories of the United States.

The Extradition of Fugitives from Service or Labor.

The Permanence of Slavery.

The Question of the Navigation of the Mississippi River.

And divers other important matters.

It might not be amiss to extend their inquiries to the rights of the South, and the question of the annexation of the Canadas to the Northern Confederacy, and its relations to the free British West Indies, would be affected; and how, on the other hand, an attempted annexation of Cuba by the Southern Confederacy, without any naval power, would be viewed by Great Britain.

We repeat, it would gratify us exceedingly to see all these important questions fully and candidly examined by a Committee of the ablest Statesmen of the South, appointed by the Nashville Convention. Their report, we have no doubt, would do more to settle the agitation in the South in regard to the Union, than indignant Senatorial denunciations of the schemes of Disunion, and patriotic Senatorial rejections of petitions for Disunion.

The very best thing that can be done to perpetuate the Union is, coolly and carefully to calculate its value.

BLINDERS.

Members of Congress do not always speak by the word. We have sometimes wondered at the coolness with which they make the most unfounded statements.

Mr. Inge of Alabama, a few days since, while speculating on the advantages to the South of a dissolution of the Union, said that two-thirds of the Southern States were in favor of such a movement. A few we shall advert to, as mere specimens.

"Our exports," he says, "are now about double those of the North."

The following table from official returns will show the value of exports from the free States and slave States for the ending June 30th, 1848:

Free States \$56,727,716 \$19,387,725 \$76,115,441
Slave States 76,115,441 1,744,000 77,859,441

In relation to the total value of exports, the two sections are nearly equal. As it regards the exports of domestic produce, and the exports of the North, for the whole of the year, the two sections are nearly equal. As it regards the exports of domestic produce, and the exports of the North, for the whole of the year, the two sections are nearly equal.

The same enlightened gentleman also remarks: "The Federal Government raises annually from the North, for the whole of the year, the sum of \$10,000,000, which is levied upon the South, for the benefit of Northern manufactures. This revenue is expended chiefly in the North; and while the South pays tribute to this Government, she is scarcely permitted to share in the largesse."

In the first place, as the North numbers about twelve millions of people, and the South about five millions, the North exports to the South, as far as the heaviest consumers, reside in the North, it is obvious that the North pays, relatively, the larger portion of the burdens imposed in the shape of customs. And in the second place, it is sheer folly to assert that this revenue is expended chiefly in the North, for the whole of the year, the sum of \$10,000,000, which is levied upon the South, for the benefit of Northern manufactures. This revenue is expended chiefly in the North; and while the South pays tribute to this Government, she is scarcely permitted to share in the largesse."

These are mere specimens of the reckless statements which are so common in the Halls of Congress, that they have ceased to excite the surprise of the experienced members of that body.

VIOLENT RESISTANCE THREATENED WITHIN THE HALLS OF CONGRESS.

The threats of violent resistance to the passage of any act, which the pro-slavery men may deem unfavorable to their interests, is quite common in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Davis of Mississippi thought it best, if Northern men persisted in their policy, that the conflict should begin "here and now"—that is, in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. Clingman, alluding to some suggestion made as he said in Northern paper, that members determined to resign, and asking for any bill to be passed, he said: "I am not a member of the House, but I am a citizen of the South, and I am determined to resist any attempt to pass any bill which is unfavorable to the interests of the South."

From this consideration alone, the present administration of Congress will be a memorable one, and a lesson to all who would attempt to govern the South by the admission of this Territory as a State, without the offer of some equivalent.

I suggest to them to remember that we are sworn to support the Constitution, and should severely sit in time and conscience and witness its open and shameful violation. The attempted consummation of such an act would be a disgrace to the South, and a disgrace to the people who represent it.

From this consideration alone, the present administration of Congress will be a memorable one, and a lesson to all who would attempt to govern the South by the admission of this Territory as a State, without the offer of some equivalent.

I suggest to them to remember that we are sworn to support the Constitution, and should severely sit in time and conscience and witness its open and shameful violation. The attempted consummation of such an act would be a disgrace to the South, and a disgrace to the people who represent it.

From this consideration alone, the present administration of Congress will be a memorable one, and a lesson to all who would attempt to govern the South by the admission of this Territory as a State, without the offer of some equivalent.

I suggest to them to remember that we are sworn to support the Constitution, and should severely sit in time and conscience and witness its open and shameful violation. The attempted consummation of such an act would be a disgrace to the South, and a disgrace to the people who represent it.

From this consideration alone, the present administration of Congress will be a memorable one, and a lesson to all who would attempt to govern the South by the admission of this Territory as a State, without the offer of some equivalent.

be reasonable men enough in Congress from both sections, to take proper care of those who should attempt to regulate its deliberations by the Bowie-Knife.

THE COMPROMISE OF MR. CLAY.

The compromise resolutions of Mr. Clay are generally repudiated by the Whig press. His motives are commended, his courage, patriotism, and ability, are admired, but his plan finds scarcely any favor. The Whig papers of Ohio are nearly all decided in their denunciation of it. The *Ohio State Journal*, of Columbus, says:

"The resolutions of Mr. Clay are producing a profound impression on the public mind. They will be read with interest throughout the length and breadth of this land. There can be no mistake about their reception in Ohio. With all their regard for Mr. Clay, with all their admiration for his splendid career as a statesman, and his long and valuable services as a Whig, our citizens do not endorse the sentiments of his resolutions. They say this 'more in sorrow than in anger,' but say it most, though it severs ties long existing and dearly cherished."

Preceding these remarks, says the *Cincinnati Gazette*: "We find a call for a public meeting of the Whigs of Franklin county, and of the State, to be held at Columbus, on Monday evening next, for the purpose of obtaining an interchange of opinion, and an expression of sentiment in reference to the vote on the compromise resolutions of Congress on the subject of slavery, and especially in reference to the resolutions recently introduced by Mr. Clay on that subject in the Senate of the United States; to utter the voice of the people of Ohio, at this important crisis."

This is right. The people of the free States have been repeating quietly, in the belief that their representatives in Congress would carry out their self-expressed determination on this point, that they see some of them giving way, and others entertaining insidious plans of compromise, they will grudge themselves again for the conflict. Craven-hearted representatives may waver, but the people who sent them here have no fear of slaveholding and disunion conventions. We do not believe that they will abandon the ground they have taken, without the consequences may be.

It can be no degradation to the South, to preserve by act of Congress freedom in free Territories. It will be an infamy to the North, should they suffer free to be converted into slave Territory. It can be no degradation to the South to apply the Jefferson Ordinance of 1785 to Free Soil; it will be a perpetual degradation to the North, should it suffer itself to be so degraded by an infamy to an abandonment of the Ordinance.

GENERAL CASES AND THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

We hope our readers will pay some attention to the report of the debate in the Senate on the Right of Petition, published on our fourth page. The course of General Cass is grossly inconsistent. On the 6th, an account of the proceedings of a meeting in North Carolina, remonstrating against action by the United States designed to limit slavery, and threatening disunion in a certain case, was presented by Mr. Mangum. The usage of the Senate has been, to raise the question of reception on all papers touching the question of slavery, except where emanating from State Legislatures, and to lay that question upon the table. Among the most rigid in the observance of the usage is General Cass. Mr. Hale, although opposed to the usage, deemed the occasion offered by the presentation of these proceedings a fine opportunity for testing the impartiality of the Senate towards the North and South, and accordingly raised the question of reception, and moved to lay that question upon the table. The motion was lost.

Messrs. Douglas and Bradley voted against the motion. General Cass, who wishes to be the next Presidential candidate of the Democratic party, and is looking to slaveholders for success, has been here for several weeks, exercising a fraternal supervision over the Pennsylvania delegation, striving, we suppose, to persuade them to support his favorite compromise—the extension of the Missouri line of 36° 30' to the Pacific.

The explanation, we presume, is to be found in the fact, that Mr. Buchanan, who wishes to be the next Presidential candidate of the Democratic party, and is looking to slaveholders for success, has been here for several weeks, exercising a fraternal supervision over the Pennsylvania delegation, striving, we suppose, to persuade them to support his favorite compromise—the extension of the Missouri line of 36° 30' to the Pacific.

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge.

Alexander Irvin took the Southern hook when there was a good bait on it, but Gilmore has taken the hook without any bait.

The editor of the *Apalachian* remarks:—"Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

majority of the people, and invalid by a minority, must be regarded by General Cass as coming within the category of measures defined by him to be of doubtful or questionable validity. And, therefore, on his own principle, he was bound respectfully to receive and consider the petition.

But the remark of Mr. Hale, in relation to the Senate generally, applies with special force to General Cass. "Change is to receive everything from the South, and reject everything from the North, without asking the nature of it?"

For the National Era, SATURDAY MORNING.

BY MISS FRIBERG CAREY.

Another Sabbath e'er the earth Comes softly down from Eden's towers And hushes all the world to rest. The hallowed influence of its hours. And now this earnest prayer goes up, And now this earnest prayer goes up, O God, that I might give, to-day, My heart and life, and soul, to thee! I, that by prayerful love was brought, Almost the fold of life within, And from a Savior's pleading arms, Went backward to a world of sin— Went back to feel a deeper shame, A thousandfold, yet more dread, For all the slightest prayers and tears Poured out upon my guilty head. Yet, Lord, thy cup of vengeance stay, Hold yet the uplifted hand divine, Thy mercy and thy love, and I, My sinners will be bent to thee. Grant that thy trembling steps may be Set firmly on the Rock of Right, Before thy servant's spirit flies, In vain, to some uncertain flight. I feel would hold the angel fast, Nor still without his blessing go, Since the sweet mercy offered me, May be the last I see below. And should this earthly Sabbath be, The last my dying soul may keep, O, shall another dawn for me, When the summons breaks my sleep?

HEARING FROM THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

We published a few weeks ago extracts from newspapers in the districts of Messrs. Duer and Clarke, rebuking them for their votes to lay the resolution of Mr. Root on the table, when it was first introduced.

Mr. Root of Pennsylvania, who pursued a similar course, is thus noticed in the *Blairsville (Pa.) Apalachian* of January 23d:

OUR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS.

Messrs. Editors of the *Apalachian*: I see by the last National Era, that Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge.

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted for the South, and he has been seen to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge."

Mr. Gilmore's vote in this case, taken in connection with his answer to the interrogatories of the Free Soil committee, when he was a candidate for Congress, places him in an unfavorable position. He has voted

